



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,878	10/12/2001	Isamu Hotta	040302-0278	7600

22428 7590 02/07/2003

FOLEY AND LARDNER  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

TRAN, DIEM T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3748

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/974,878

Applicant(s)

HOTTA ET AL.

Examiner

Diem Tran

Art Unit

3748

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/15/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### DETAILED ACTION

- This office action is in response to the Request for Reconsideration filed on 1/15/03. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is hereby withdrawn and a new final rejection is set forth below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett et al. (US Patent 5,939,028).

Regarding claim 1, Bennett discloses an exhaust emission control device of an internal combustion engine, comprising:

a CO oxidation catalyst; and a water trap disposed upstream of and close to the CO oxidation catalyst (see col. 8, lines 18-25).

Regarding claim 7, Bennett further discloses the CO oxidation catalyst has low temperature light-off characteristics (see col. 6, lines 43-47; col. 9, lines 48-55).

Regarding claim 8, Bennett further discloses a secondary air supply unit disposed upstream of the water trap (see Figure 1).

Art Unit: 3748

3. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Frost et al. (US Patent 5,776,417).

Regarding claims 2, 4, Frost discloses an exhaust emission control device of an internal combustion engine, comprising:

an underfloor catalyst wherein a CO oxidation catalyst and a water trap are coated on a support (see col. 3, lines 14-19); and

a HC trap disposed upstream of the water trap (see Figure 1, see col. 2, lines 3-17).

Regarding claim 3, Frost further discloses the water trap being disposed upstream of the CO oxidation catalyst (see col. 2, lines 21-30).

Regarding claims 5, 6, Frost further discloses that the water trap and CO oxidation catalyst are disposed as layers or mixed to each other (see col. 3, lines 14-22).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. in view of Frost et al (JP 409103645).

Regarding claim 9, Bennett discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above; however, fails to disclose a HC trap disposed upstream of the water trap. Frost teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a HC trap disposed upstream of the water trap (see SOLUTION, lines 15-18).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized HC trap disposed upstream of the water trap as taught by Frost in the Bennett device since such would have increased the efficiency of the emission control system.

6. Claims 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett et al. in view of Mizuno et al. (US Patent 6,029,441).

Regarding claim 10, Bennett discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 1 above, Bennett further discloses a secondary air supply unit disposed upstream of the water trap (see Figure 1); however, fails to disclose a HC trap disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit. Mizuno teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a HC trap (10) disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit (16) (see Figure 2; see col. 8, lines 51-63).

Regarding claim 11, Bennett discloses an exhaust emission control device of an internal combustion engine, comprising:

a low temperature light-off CO oxidation catalyst (see col. 9, lines 48-55); a water trap disposed upstream of and close to the CO oxidation catalyst (see col. 8, lines 18-25); a secondary air supply unit disposed upstream of the water trap (see Figure 1); however, fails to disclose a HC trap disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit.

Art Unit: 3748

Mizuno teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a HC trap disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit (see Figure 2; see col. 8, lines 51-63).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized HC trap disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit as taught by Mizuno in the Bennett device since such would have increased the efficiency of the emission control system.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Frost et al. (US Patent 5,776,417) in view of Mizuno et al. (US Patent 6,029,441).

Regarding claim 12, Frost discloses an exhaust emission control device of an internal combustion engine, comprising:

an underfloor catalyst wherein a low temperature light-off CO oxidation catalyst and a water trap are coated on a support (see col. 3, lines 14-19);

a secondary air supply unit disposed upstream of the underfloor catalyst (see Figure 9); however, fails to disclose a HC trap disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit. Mizuno teaches that it is conventional in the art, to utilize a HC trap disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit (see Figure 2; see col. 8, lines 51-63).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilized said HC trap disposed upstream of the secondary air supply unit as taught by Mizuno in the Frost device since such would have increased the efficiency of the emission control system.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/15/03 have been fully considered and were persuasive, therefore, the finality of that action is hereby withdrawn; however, a new final rejection is set forth above.

In the amendment filed on 8/7/ 02, the Applicant argued that the Bennett reference fails to disclose arranging the water trap close to the CO oxidation catalyst. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, the Bennett reference discloses that the water trap and CO oxidation catalyst are disposed as layers to each other (see col. 8, lines 25-28) that reads on the claimed limitations in claim 1. Claims in a pending application are given their broadest reasonable interpretation See *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA 1974).

Applicant's amendment filed on 8/7/02 necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Diem Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-6073. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 8:30 a.m.- 5:00p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (703) 308-2623. The fax number for this group is (703) 308-7763.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

DT  
January 30, 2003



Diem Tran  
Patent Examiner  
Art unit 3748



THOMAS DENION  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700